



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in these countries) having been bestowed in 1857. The practical question still, however, remains—(a question in which, surely, all Roman Catholic Christendom is deeply concerned)—why should these plenary indulgences, in the form of a jubilee, be *restricted* to even the comparatively short period of 6 or 7 years? Why should the treasury of spiritual blessings, of which the key is in the pope's hands, to open whenever he pleases, be ever shut? Verily, the *power of the keys* seems to be in no very good keeping, and might much better be placed in the hands of the Humane Society, than in those of a man who, affecting to be Vicar-General of Christ on earth, shows so little of the spirit of his Divine Master, who always went about doing good, and relieving the wants, spiritual and temporal, of all those who were "faithful" believers in His divine mission.

To prevent the possibility of committing any error in our judgment, or mistake as to the doctrine in question, we have just opened a work of high practical authority on the subject, printed by R. Grace and Son, 45, Capel-street, Dublin, entitled "Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs to the Faithful, collected by a member of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences in Rome, translated into English with the permission of Superiors." The definition of an indulgence is thus given in page v. :—

"An indulgence is the remission of the temporal punishment which generally remains due to sins already forgiven in the sacrament of penance, as to the guilt and eternal punishment. This remission is made by the application of the merits and satisfactions which are contained in the treasures of the Church. These treasures are the accumulations of the spiritual goods arising from the infinite merits and satisfaction of Jesus Christ, with the superabundant merits and satisfactions of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the holy martyrs, and of the other saints, which ultimately derive their efficacy from the merits and satisfactions of Christ, who is the only mediator of redemption. These CELESTIAL TREASURES, as they are called by the Council of Trent, are committed by the Divine bounty to the dispensation of the Church, the sacred spouse of Christ, and are the ground and matter of indulgences. They are infinite in reference to the merits of Christ, and cannot, therefore, be ever exhausted."

We take the description of a jubilee from an equally authentic source^b :—

"A jubilee signifies a plenary indulgence in its most ample form, granted at different periods by the sovereign pontiff to those who, either residing in the city of Rome or visiting it, perform there the *visitations of the churches* and other prescribed works of piety, prayer, fasting, and alms deeds, with confession and communion, which are always enjoined for the giving of this indulgence, in order to facilitate the return of sinners to God by the last-mentioned exercises of religion. Most extensive powers are accorded by the supreme pontiff to all approved ministers of the sacrament of penance, a principal object of which indulgence is not only to encourage Christians to a closer union with, and a livelier sense of their dependence, in spiritual matters, on the *supreme pontiff*, who governs them as Christ's vicar on earth, but principally to induce them, by holding out *every possible encouragement to pray to God*, and perform works of piety in those places and under those circumstances which shall be most acceptable to God, and most conducive to their own spiritual advantage."

Let us see now how far the *jubilee* affords every possible "encouragement to pray to God." Cardinal Wiseman annexes to his Pastoral the following

CONDITIONS FOR GAINING THE JUBILEE.

"1st—A contrite and sincere confession of sin, and sacramental absolution (that is, to and by the priest); for which purpose, it is subsequently stated, 'that the clergy are to have the fullest powers of the confessional during the period.'"

"2nd—The worthy and devout receiving of the blessed Eucharist.

"3rd—A visit to three churches, or three visits to one.

"4th—At each visit to pray for a *short space* for the exaltation and prosperity of Holy Mother Church and of the Apostolic See; for the *uprooting* of heresy; and for the peace and concord of Christian (i.e., of course, Roman Catholic) princes, and the peace and unity of the whole Christian (Roman Catholic) people.

"5th—To give, first, an alms to the poor, and, second, to contribute towards 'the propagation of the faith;' for which distinct object an alms-chest, legibly labelled, and

^b Instructions and Devotions for the 40 hours' adoration ordered in the Churches in Dublin during the Jubilee of 1852, published with the approbation of the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, James Duffy, 7, Wellington-quay, Dublin, 1852.

pointed out by the priest reading this pastoral, shall be set aside in each church.

"6th—To fast one day.

"On observance of these conditions the holy father grants the most plenary indulgence, in form of jubilee, applicable to the faithful departed."

The conditions expressed in Dr. Dixon's pastoral are substantially the same, though somewhat differently worded; the 4th and 5th are "to give *some* alms to the poor," and "to give a pious donation to the funds of the Propagation of the Faith, according to the devotion of each." The poor are in both documents named; but the grand object seems to be to *pray* for a *short space* for the exaltation of the Church, and the rooting out of heresies, and to fill with devotion (that is liberal) donations the coffers of the Propaganda. And this is in practice what in theory is said to be *principally* designed to hold out every *possible encouragement to pray to God*. Is it not manifest to every intelligent mind that the whole affair is merely a *pious fraud* to *cheat* mankind into virtue, or rather the virtue of submission to the Holy See, and hatred of heretics? and that if the real object were to relieve souls of "the faithful departed" from the pains of purgatory, no pope, unless he were a wicked and inhuman tyrant, could keep shut that "inexhaustible treasury of spiritual blessings" which is at all times at his disposal to relieve them. We have in former volumes shown that previous to the time of Thomas Aquinas, A.D. 1220, indulgences were accounted *pious frauds* by very learned and pious Roman Catholics, though Thomas Aquinas somewhat naively rejects their opinion, "because it is, in plain terms, to make the Church guilty of a notorious cheat!" as we firmly believe it to be.^c The only other observation we shall make at present on these contemporaneous pastorals is, that in the annexed dispensations for Lent, in 1858, Cardinal Wiseman is much more liberal than Dr. Dixon in his *indulgences* in continued comforts which may be enjoyed by the faithful without breaking the rules.

John Bull is not quite so used to meagre diet as Paddy, and therefore the use of *dripping* and *lard*, as well as *cheese*, is allowed to the former, while no such liberty is given to the latter. As far as cheese goes, perhaps it is no great privation in Ireland; but to keep poor Paddy from the *dripping* or *lard*, if he could get it, does seem to us rather hard, and worthy of reconsideration by the Most Rev. Archbishop, &c.

We subjoin the *dispensations*, for the benefit of all those who desire to avail themselves of them, though we own that we find it hard to understand the theory of these dispensations. If cheese, lard, and dripping are really impediments to a Christian in his heavenly course, why should bishops give dispensations allowing their flocks to gratify their palates at the expense of their soul's interests?

According to Cardinal Wiseman—

"1. Flesh meat is allowed at the single meal of those who are bound to fast, &c. On Sundays even those who are bound to fast may eat flesh meat at their discretion. (*We trust not gluttonously.*)"

"2. Eggs are allowed at the single meal, on all days except Ash Wednesday, the three last days in Holy Week.

"3. Cheese under same restrictions.

"4. The use of dripping or lard is permitted at dinner and collation, on all days except Ash Wednesday and Good Friday.

"On those days, Sundays included, whenever flesh meat is allowed, fish is not permitted at the same meal."

✠ "N. CARDINAL WISEMAN."

DR. DIXON'S DISPENSATIONS.

"1. Flesh meat is allowed on all Sundays, and, with the exception of the first and last weeks, it is allowed once on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays.

"2. Flesh meat allowed on the feast of St. Patrick.

"3. Eggs allowed at the single meal, except on Wednesdays and Fridays of the first and last week, and on Fridays of the weeks of Lent.

"4. White meats are prohibited on Ash Wednesday

^c See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. II. p. 6, January, 1858.

^d See Tablet of 13th February, 1858.

and on the Wednesday and Friday of Holy Week. On those days whenever flesh meat is allowed, fish is not permitted at the same meal.

✠ "JOSEPH DIXON."

We abstain from commenting on this sad burlesque, which is made in too many cases the substitute for that religion of the heart which can alone make man fit for the inheritance of the Saints in Light.

Correspondence.

ON PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—The able article in your last number on "Private Judgment," which I suspect is from the pen of Archbishop Whately, has induced me, rooted and grounded as I am in the faith of the holy Catholic Church, to reconsider the great subject of infallibility as held and taught since the days of our Lord and His Apostles. And first permit me to say a few words with respect to "private judgment," which Protestants seem to glory in as their exclusive privilege, and which they suppose no Roman Catholic dares to exercise for himself. In this they are grievously mistaken, and I for one fully recognize the *right*, the *duty*, aye, and the *necessity* of private judgment, but under reasonable restrictions and within proper limitations. If a man arrive at the absurd conclusion that there are *three* Gods, truly and numerically; surely no Protestant *ought* to say you have a *right* to your private opinion, though I think you very wrong. I will go farther, and admit no man has a *right* to his opinion unless it be one capable of being sustained by proof and sufficient evidence, and, to use the words of Locke, no proposition should be entertained with greater assurance than the proofs it is built upon will warrant. Let us take the case of the venerable Father Newman to illustrate what I wish to write on private judgment. He was once a member of the Anglican communion, and when satisfied of the falsity of its teachings he came over to the Church of Rome. Now, in doing so, his very *first step* was an act of *private judgment*. He saw it written in God's word, Matt., 28, 20—John, xiv. 16, 17, and xvi. 13, that Christ was to be with His Church *all* days to the end of the world, and that the Paraclete was to teach her *all* truth; and having from these and other passages concluded that an infallible Church *must* be somewhere on earth, he, in the exercise of his private judgment, resolved on attaching himself to that Church which alone *claimed* infallibility, and which alone *gives marks and tokens* to the world that it is the only infallible Church of Christ, viz., unity, catholicity, apostolicity, and sanctity. But once he joined this Church on sufficient evidence of its infallibility, there his private judgment ended; quoad, the consideration of its teaching, private judgment was no longer *necessary*; *doubt* is not possible where belief in infallibility is established. It is not correct to say that "if we decide on this (infallibility), then we may take all the rest of our opinions on *trust from the priest*." Every Catholic knows and admits that the pastors and prelates of his Church are fallible, and that any of them may fall into heresies, and, consequently, be deceived, but that the *whole* Church should be deceived and fall into error he believes to be impossible—Matthew, 16, 18. Surely, any man of sense, when about to undertake a voyage, would exercise his private judgment in selecting a good ship, skilful captain, &c.; and any one sick would, in the same way, choose a good physician, and "if a number of persons tell us that the captain is incompetent, and the physician we are about to employ a quack, we shall do well to look very sharp before we entrust ourselves to them without reserve." But I deny the justness of the application of this analogy to the subject of infallibility. It does not surely follow, that *because* the Eastern Church and the English Church, &c., reject the dogma of infallibility, that, therefore, we are in the position of those who are cautioned against employing an unskilful sea captain for a voyage, or a quack in case of sickness. My answer is, if half the world told me my captain or my physician were unskilful, or that I was wrong in entrusting myself to his care, I would not regard it for an instant. Why? Because God has told me to *hear the Church*, and, through His Apostle, that it is the pillar and ground of the truth. My captain is Christ; ergo, I can't err in following Him. My physician is Christ; ergo, I can't do wrong when implicitly doing what he prescribes. My ship is the vessel of that Church which He purchased with His blood, and which will infallibly conduct me to the haven of eternal rest. The human mind longs for rest, and there can be no true peace till the soul rests in the ark of truth. Protestants variorum creeds cannot possibly give peace or rest,

"As long as words a different sense will bear,
And each may be his own interpreter,
Our airy faith will no foundation find;
The world's a weathercock for every wind."

I have been in most of the Protestant churches in this city, and in no two of them have I heard the *same sound*; and if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? One clergyman preaches

Arminianism, and teaches that the Saviour shed His blood for all men; another clergyman preaches Calvinism, and teaches He did not die for all men, but only for the elect. One clergyman teaches every child duly baptised is necessarily regenerated; another clergyman teaches that this is Popery. One clergyman teaches that good works are necessary to salvation; another holds that they are nothing but filthy rags. Now, amid this discordancy of doctrines in the same Church, what, in the name of common sense, is a man to do? Which of them is right? They both can't be right, but both may be wrong.

I admit, sir, the good temper exhibited in your columns, and though our doctrines are sometimes not fairly stated, yet I believe they are not misstated wilfully. I am an old man anxious to know the truth, and, knowing it, to practise it.

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

[We cannot claim for our article on private judgment such distinguished authorship as our correspondent gives us credit for. But we make no pretensions to originality, and we frankly acknowledge (what, indeed, we could not conceal from any attentive reader of the works of the prelate referred to) that our correspondent has guessed rightly the source of most of our arguments and illustrations.]

We cannot find that our correspondent has succeeded in overthrowing any one of the principles laid down in our article. He tells us that "private judgment is not the exclusive privilege of Protestants, and that Roman Catholics dare exercise it for themselves." This was the very point which we laboured in our article to prove. We tried to show that a Roman Catholic's whole religious position was founded on an exercise of private judgment; and, therefore, that whatever uncertainty or other disadvantage attends the exercise of private judgment, affects the Roman Catholic as well as the Protestant.

Let us take our correspondent's illustration—the case of Dr. Newman, or any other Anglican who joins the Romish communion. It is evident he must begin with a most audacious exercise of private judgment. He must, by his own private study of Scripture, come to the conclusion that the Church in which he was baptised is heretical and schismatical; and that the clergy who are his guides, or the bishops who are set over him, are all mistaken. But, according to our correspondent, when he has once convinced himself of the existence of an infallible guide, private judgment ceases, and doubt ceases. We reply that he can never disembarass his belief of whatever doubt and uncertainty there may be about the first great act of private judgment on which all the rest depends. Father Newman arrived at his present position by the exercise of his private judgment on the texts—"Hear the Church," "The pillar and ground of the truth," &c. Now, these are as hard texts as any in the Bible. If private judgment can arrive with positive certainty at the meaning of these texts, why should it not be trusted with the interpretation of other texts? But if private judgment is always liable to doubt and mistake, Dr. Newman may have been wrong in his inferring, from these texts, the infallibility of the Church of Rome, and, therefore, also, wrong in all that he has received on that Church's authority.

If a man constructs a scaffold of wood, and then proceeds to build, with brick and stone, on the top of it, it is in vain for him to boast of the strength of his building and the solidity of his materials, the whole structure cannot be stronger than the scaffold on which it rests. And if the wood-work beneath be rotten, the more solid materials he lays on it the sooner it is likely to bring the whole thing about his ears.

Our correspondent says, "I cannot err in following Christ, who is my Captain. I cannot do wrong when doing implicitly what He prescribes."

Granted. But you may do wrong by supposing that our Lord has prescribed what He has not prescribed. You may err by fancying that you are following Christ, when, in reality, you are only taking the course which promises to relieve you quickest from the trouble and responsibility of investigation into truth.

Lastly, our correspondent taunts us with the difference of opinion which exist between those who do not profess to follow an infallible guide. Now, the whole question is, do these differences relate to essential points? For Roman Catholics have their differences too, but they say they do not relate to essential points. Why may not members of the Church of England urge the same plea? There are in our Church, Calvinists and Arminians, but the Arminians do not deny the possibility that Calvinists may be saved, nor the Calvinists the possibility that Arminians may be saved. And even our correspondent's own principles, he would not argue that Christ must have provided His Church with an infallible guide, who should preserve it from every possible controversy or error, but only from going wrong on those points where an error would be fatal to salvation.]

THE RULE OF CATHOLIC FAITH, WHAT IS IT?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—Considering the zeal displayed by some to make converts to the Roman faith, and the various persecutions which Protestants have at different periods undergone for refusing to embrace that faith, and particularly for refusing to subscribe to the doctrine of transubstantia-

tion, we have hitherto been led to believe that our doctrine and teaching are as opposite as the north is to the south; so different, indeed, that a conscientious Romanist must believe that there can be no salvation for us Protestants, out of their Church, &c. If we do not subscribe their doctrines. Many of us have had practical experience of the bitter feelings and animosities existing against the "reformed religion."

With a knowledge that such sentiments do exist, it may be new to some of your readers to hear that the Church of Rome has, nevertheless, produced some apologists for their system, who have argued that it is not so opposed to the Protestant faith as it is represented to be, either by members of their own communion or by "the gentlemen of the reformed religion," among whom stand prominent Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, and Veron. Bossuet wrote his "Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church" expressly to prove "that the aversion which these gentlemen (of the reformed religion) have to most of our [Romish] sentiments is grounded upon some false ideas which they have formed concerning them" (Dublin Edition, 1831, sec. 1, p. 5), and he argues that on examination many subjects of existing dispute vanish, "and those disputes which remain will not appear (according to the principles of the reformed) of such magnitude as at first they endeavoured to represent them" (p. 6). While Veron has taken every peculiar doctrine of the Roman Church against which we protest, as having no warranty in Scripture, and dressed them up in such harmless, equivocal, negative garbs that he has not only made them palatable to Protestants, but has even given up, one after the other, as unnecessary to be believed in that strict and rigid manner so much insisted upon by many Romish controversialists, those tenets which Romanists have usually held so sacred.

You did me the favour of inserting one letter of this subject in your January number, wherein I observed that, according to Veron, the whole practical teaching of "saint worship" is, if not actually repudiated, so ignored and negatived that we might be all sound Papists, and discredit their whole theory and practice in this important branch of doctrine and teaching. I propose now, with your kind permission, to follow up the subject, and show how, according to Veron, one may hold the Protestant doctrine of the spiritual presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and still be a sound and orthodox Romanist. But before I proceed to Veron, permit me to call the reader's attention to a strange blunder Bossuet makes, in his zeal to assimilate Protestant and Romish teaching. If there is a subject on which we so widely differ it is that on "merit of good works." These words Bossuet very properly selects as a title for a separate section in the work above mentioned (sec. vii., p. 22). He is most anxious to show how we agree on this important head. He says that they (Romanists) use the word "merit" to "show the value, price, and dignity of those works which we perform through grace. But as all their sanctity comes from God, who produces them in us, the same Church has, in the Council of Trent, received these words of St. Augustine, as a DOCTRINE OF CATHOLIC FAITH, that 'God crowns His own gifts in crowning the merits of His servants'" (p. 23). Now, this is eminently a Protestant sentiment, and they, therefore, so shocked the propriety of certain learned theologians of the Roman Church that we find in that standard of orthodoxy, the "Expurgatory Index," these very words of Augustine ordered to be expunged from his works, as conveying decidedly heretical teaching.

The Churches of England and Ireland teach that there is a real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but after a spiritual manner, and is so received by the faithful recipient. "Our souls are nourished by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine." We deny that these elements change their substance; they still remain what they seem to the eye and taste, literal bread and wine; but we feed on Christ spiritually, these elements being signs, types, symbols, or figures (the outward and visible signs) of His body and blood (the thing signified). For holding this doctrine many of our reformers were brought to the stake, and burnt alive; it was declared a "damnable heresy." We have hitherto believed that the great distinction between us and Romanists is, that they repudiate this spiritual presence. They require us to believe, under pain of anathema (for, thank God, they cannot now burn us), that the consecrated elements are no longer what they seem to be, but that the whole substance of the elements is changed, and as they express themselves, transubstantiated into the body, blood, bones and nerves, soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. They are no longer bread and wine, but entire Christ—"true God and true man under the appearance of each;" and the mass is the "same sacrifice" as was made on the cross. It is "the same Christ who once offered Himself a bleeding victim to His heavenly Father on the cross" (see Dr. James Butler's Catechism, Dublin, 1845, p. 59, 60); the same Christ who was born of the Virgin Mary. And so Cardinal Biel, in his Fourth Lecture on the Canon of the Mass, says, "The Virgin Mary once conceived the Son of God, while the priest

daily calls into existence corporally the same Son of God." And that the manducation is carnal and sensual is clear from the declaration that Berengarius was compelled by Pope Nicholas II., at a council, to sign, in the presence of 118 bishops, which states that "the body and blood of Christ is sensibly not only in the sacrament, but verily handled by the priest, broken and rent with the teeth of the faithful."

Now, what teaching does Veron present to us? Referring to 1 Cor. x. 16, he says, "Hence the body of Christ, which is present under the eucharistic symbols, may, in this sense, be called spiritual, and not carnal body; and our Saviour, who is actually present in the sacrament, may be called a quickening spirit, and not made into a living body."

The italics are in all these quotations as in the original.

Again—
"Not only may the body of Christ, though really present under the eucharistic symbols, be called a spiritual body, and Christ Himself a spirit; but the body of Christ may be said to be present under the appearance of bread and wine, in a spiritual manner, or spiritually, and not in a corporeal and natural manner, or, which is the same thing, not corporally or carnally" (p. 99).

"We do not eat Christ in this manner (by manducating and dividing); therefore he is not eaten corporally, nor in a corporeal and carnal, but in a spiritual manner; and by consequence spiritually" (p. 100).

"If it were to happen that a mouse or a dog were to gnaw or eat the host, or rather the eucharistic species, though these animals might consume the accidents, they would not eat the body of Christ" (p. 108).

It must be remembered that the substance of bread has, according to Tridentine doctrine, ceased to exist, and the shape, colour, &c.—that is, the accidents—only remain. What, then, does the mouse consume?

"Man, indeed (adds Veron), eats the body of Christ, because he receives it as a sign, or rather as the cause of grace." "Our adversaries ought really to make no objection to this doctrine; for, suppose a dog should chance to eat a piece of the bread used by them in the Lord's supper, the dog would not eat the sacrament, because it does not consume the bread as a symbol or sign" (p. 108).

"The Catholic Church merely teaches that the body of Christ is, by the power of God, present under the eucharistic species" (p. 105); and the Romanist may believe, without being accounted a heretic, with us Protestants, that that presence is only, after all, in a spiritual manner or spiritually! It was scarcely worth while burning Granmer, Ridley, and Latimer, for so they also believed.

Veron quietly winds up his chapter by saying, "that this view of the doctrine 'is no wise opposed to their (Protestant) salvation. If so, why, then, cause so much disturbance?" and he wishes us to sink all our apparent differences, and join the Church of Rome again.

With regard to "transubstantiation," it may be remembered by some of your readers that Dr. Cahill, in defence of this doctrine (see Tablet, 17th December, 1858, and subsequent weeks), in his endeavour to prove not only the reasonableness of the doctrine, but that it is a common occurrence in nature, actually provides as a direct parallel to "transubstantiation," the digestion and conversion of the food we eat. "The food, &c., that is, the bread and wine which you and all men may have eaten on this day, had been changed into flesh and blood on your own person and on the persons of all men, by the word of God on the vital action of the stomach," so argues Dr. Cahill.

But hear Veron—

"It is not an article of faith—it is even blasphemous to pretend, that in this mystery the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ, in the same manner as the bread that we eat is changed into our bodily substance; nor is it of faith that by transubstantiation the matter of the bread begins to exist under the form of Christ's body just as the matter of bread that is eaten, by nourishing us, begins to subsist under the form of the human body" (p. 107).

He further asserts—

"Nor is it of faith that transubstantiation is effected by the reproduction or consecration of Christ's body" (p. 108); or "that the bread and wine are annihilated by the words of consecration" (p. 109), though the Council of Trent, be it remembered, desires us to believe that the substance of these elements ceases to exist!

But why pursue the subject? Veron thinks that the doctrine of his Church, as he explains it, "is not a just ground for separation" (p. 118); in fact, in other words, so long as we submit to the dominion of the priests of Rome, we may believe just as we please. The teaching of the Church of Rome is at all times and in all things so plastic and accommodating that it will suit all castes, creeds, and shadows of belief! from the Brahmin Hindoo, as witnessed by the Jesuit missions, to the heretic Protestant, as witnessed by Veron.

I will now only repeat, that this book from which I am quoting is declared to be in the "preface"—"WELL KNOWN

to Semel concepti Dei filium, diuitem Dei filium atque tantum quotidie corporaliter.—Gub. Bich, super eadem Missa, Lect. iv.; Edit. Lugdun., 1642.

"Corpus et sanguinem Domini benedictum non solum sacramento, sed veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari frangit, et distillat deinde altari."—Graham corp. pur. can. (tom. i., p. 210), par. iii., tit. 2, c. 2; Paris, 1842.

Page 99; Edition, Birmingham, 1858. Translated by Veron, worth a Roman priest.

Ex Indole Augustini Solent. Non merita nostra, sed donum Dei consistit in nobis. —Lectio Expurgatoria, James Burnet ad Cardinalem et Roxas Madrid, 1612, et per Turres. Geneva 1619.